

Application Serial No. 10/544,108

Amendment Dated: July 14, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: May 22, 2009

REMARKS

This response is a reply to the Office Action mailed May 22, 2009 which was responsive to the communications filed by the applicant on March 30, 2009.

There are 62 claims pending in the application, of which claims 1 to 36 were originally presented and claims 37 to 62 were added in the previous Office Action response.

Applicant has cancelled claims 1 through 36.

Applicant has not amended any of claims 37 through 62.

Claims 37 and 44 are independent.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chan et al (U.S. Patent 7,359,313; hereinafter Chan).

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 4, 10, 21, 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Schilling et al (U.S. Patent 6,757,322; hereinafter Schilling).

The Examiner objected to claims 6 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Onggosanusi et al (U.S. Patent 7,133,459; hereinafter Onggosanusi).

The Examiner objected to claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Hochwald et al (U.S. Patent 7,236,536; hereinafter Hochwald).

The Examiner objected to claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan and Onggosanusi as applied to claim 6 and further in view of Hochwald et al (U.S. Patent 7,236,536; hereinafter Hochwald).

Application Serial No. 10/544,108

Amendment Dated: July 14, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated: May 22, 2009

The Examiner objected to claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan, Onggosanusi, and Hochwald as applied to claim 7 and further in view of Gorokhov et al (U.S. Patent 7,397,826; hereinafter Gorokhov).

The Examiner objected to claims 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan and Schilling as applied to claim 10 and further in view of Ten Brink (European Patent 0998045; hereinafter Brink).

The Examiner objected to claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan, Schilling, Ten Brink et al and further in view of Onggosanusi.

The Examiner objected to claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Langberg et al (U.S. Patent 5,852,630; hereinafter Langberg).

The Examiner objected to claims 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Forsythe et al (U.S. Patent 6,745,050; hereinafter Forsythe).

The Applicant has cancelled the claims 1-36. The remaining claims 37-62 have been indicated by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicant submits that the Application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits action to that end.

Respectfully submitted,
MYSORE, Naveen et al

By: /Trevor C. Klotz/

Trevor Klotz
Reg. No. 23,136
Perley-Robertson Hill & McDougall LLP
1400-340 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 0A5
CANADA